



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,899	08/10/2001	R. David L. Campbell	KANG115519	5461

26389 7590 06/14/2004

CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC
1420 FIFTH AVENUE
SUITE 2800
SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2004

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

22

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,899

Applicant(s)

CAMPBELL ET AL.

Examiner

Etienne P LeRoux

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: ____.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- 1) whether said user request may be granted
- 2) access to a second server computer should also be granted

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 9 recites "determining whether said new user has previously been added to said group of users authorized to utilize said network database; and in response to determining that said new user has previously been added to said group of authorized users, denying said request to add said new user." The claim is incomprehensible. How can the user simultaneously be added and not added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-8, 10-14, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Pat No 5,968,176 issued to Nessett et al (hereafter Nessett).

Claims 1, 22 and 23:

Nessett discloses a method for providing remote access to the facilities of a server computer, comprising:

- receiving a user request [Fig 2, 111] to access a first server computer [Fig 2, 104];
- determining whether said user request may be granted [col 15, lines 55-65] ;
- in response to determining that said user request may be granted, determining whether access to a second server computer [Fig 2, 108] should also be granted; and in response to determining that access to said second server computer should be granted
- transmitting a request to access to said second server computer from said first server computer to said second server computer via a secure communications connection [col 15, lines 55-65 and col 16, lines 13-20].

Art Unit: 2171

Claim 2:

Nessett discloses wherein said second server computer comprises a server computer operative to store and update a network database [col 15, lines 55-65].

Claims 3 and 13:

Nessett discloses wherein said first server computer comprises a server computer operative to provide an Internet Web site [Fig 2, and col 15, lines 40-47]

Claims 4 and 10:

Nessett discloses wherein said second server computer is operative to provide facilities for storing and updating said network database in a manner that is visually consistent with said Internet Web site [Fig 2 and col 15, lines 40-47].

Claim 5:

Nessett discloses receiving an indication that access to said second server computer may be granted, redirecting said user from said first computer to said second computer [col 15, lines 55-65].

Claim 6:

Nessett discloses a method for providing remote access to the facilities of a server computer, comprising receiving a request at a server computer operative to store and update a network database to add a new user to a group of users authorized to utilize said network database; determining whether said request may be granted; and in response to determining that

Art Unit: 2171

said request may be granted, adding said new user to said group of users authorized to utilize said network database [Fig 2 and col 16, line 55 through col 17, line 3]

Claims 7 and 12:

Nessett discloses wherein said request is received over a secure communications link from a second server computer [col 16, lines 13-20].

Claim 8:

Nessett discloses wherein a login and password for said new user are provided as a part of said request [col 12, lines 10-21].

Claim 11:

Nessett discloses a method for providing remote access to the facilities of a server computer, comprising: receiving a request at a server computer operative to store and update a network database to update user data for a user authorized to utilize said network database; determining whether said request may be granted; and in response to determining that said request may be granted, updating said user data as specified in said request [Fig 2 and col 16, line 55 – col 17, line 3].

Claim 14:

Nessett discloses a method for providing remote access to the facilities of a server computer, comprising: receiving a request for a facility available at a server computer operative to store and update a network database via a secure communications link; determining whether said request may be granted; and in response to determining that said request may be granted,

Art Unit: 2171

executing said facility at said server computer according to said request [Fig 2, col 15, lines 55-65 and col 16, lines 13-20]

Claim 17:

Nessett discloses wherein said facility comprises an application programming interface for creating a new collaborative group in which users may share data [col 16, line 55-col 17, line 3].

Claim 19:

Nessett discloses wherein said request further comprises the identity of one or more users to be added to said new collaborative group [col 16, line 55-col 17, line 3].

Claim 20:

Nessett discloses wherein said facility comprises an application programming interface for adding new users to an existing collaborative group in which users may share data [col 16, line 55-col 17, line 3].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 15, 16 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nessett in view of US Pat No 5,941,947 issued to Brown et al (hereafter Brown).

Art Unit: 2171

Claims 15, 16 and 21:

Nessett discloses the elements of claim 14 as noted above.

Nessett fails to disclose wherein said facility comprises an application programming interface for deleting access rights for a user to said server computer.

Brown discloses wherein said facility comprises an application programming interface for deleting access rights for a user to said server computer [claim 49].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nessett to include wherein said facility comprises an application programming interface for deleting access rights for a user to said server computer as taught by Brown.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Nessett per the above for the purpose of regulating access on a very strict basis.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nessett in view of US Pat No 5,787,175 issued to Carter (hereafter Carter).

Claim 18:

Nessett discloses the elements of claims 14 and 17 as noted above

Nessett fails to disclose determining whether a quota has been exceeded prior to creating said collaborative group.

Carter discloses determining whether a quota has been exceeded prior to creating said collaborative group [col 21, lines 50-61].

Art Unit: 2171

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Nessett to include determining whether a quota has been exceeded prior to creating said collaborative group as taught by Carter.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Nesset per the above for the purpose of obtaining accurate input from the collaborative user's group [col 21, lines 50-61].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: US Pat No. 6,470,453 issued to Vilhuber discloses a client establishes connection with a first server and with a second server in Figure 3A.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (703) 305-0620.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patent related correspondence can be forwarded via the following FAX number (703) 872-9306

Etienne LeRoux

June 9, 2004

